



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"Thus is the congregation of Israel restored to its true condition. From the diaspora the living return, and from their graves the dead arise, in order to enjoy in the holy land the promised glory of the Messianic age."

OLD TESTAMENT WORD-STUDIES: 2. CONSTITUENT PARTS OF MAN.

BY REV. P. A. NORDELL, D. D.,

New London, Conn.

The complexity of man's constitution has been recognized from the earliest times. The most obvious line of division falls between the material and spiritual parts of his organization. Each of these comprises subdivisions more or less numerous and subtle according to the observer's intuition and skill in discriminating psychological phenomena. Among the Hebrews, as among all the nations of antiquity, this line of demarcation, however sharply drawn at first sight, exhibits a tendency to disappear the moment we undertake to separate rigidly between the material and spiritual. This tendency springs from the constant association of spiritual states and emotions with certain parts of the material organism, and from the evolution of higher psychological significations from words used primarily in a physiological or material sense. Moreover, in words belonging to the vocabulary of common life we cannot hope to find the nice discriminations of a scientific terminology.

$\text{Ru}(\text{ä})\text{h}$ *spirit*.

The primary signification of $\text{r}\hat{\text{u}}(\text{ä})\text{h}$ is wind, the sensible movement of the air in all gradations of velocity, from the gentle zephyr at the "cool of the day," Gen. 3:8, to the terrific tempest that rends the mountains, 1 Kgs. 19:11. Hebrew seems to have had no word for air, the atmosphere at rest, since in this condition it was not perceptible. That wind was identical with the *breath* of men and animals was soon apparent, and although the latter received the specific name $\text{n}'\text{s}\hat{\text{h}}\hat{\text{a}}\text{m}\hat{\text{a}}(\text{h})$, yet it continued very frequently to be called simply $\text{r}\hat{\text{u}}(\text{ä})\text{h}$. The latter designates the breath of beasts, Eccl. 9:13, of mankind, Job 10:12, and of Jehovah, 2 Sam. 22:16. When a living being dies it ceases to breathe, i. e. it *expires*. It was natural that a superficial observer, perceiving this close connection between breath and life, would leap to the conclusion that the invisible breath of life was somehow identical with wind, the invisible breath of nature. $\text{R}\hat{\text{u}}(\text{ä})\text{h}$ became thus the general designation of the principle of life which man shares in common with all creatures who possess the $\text{r}\hat{\text{u}}(\text{ä})\text{h}$ $\text{h}\check{\text{ä}}\text{y}\text{y}\hat{\text{im}}$,—in Gen. 7:22 tautologically described as the "breath of the spirit of lives." But in man, as distinguished from the brute, this principle of life was also recognized as intelligent spirit, the seat of sensation, passion, unrest, anxiety, courage, as well as of will, determination, knowledge, wisdom, and skill. From this view of man as intelligent $\text{r}\hat{\text{u}}(\text{ä})\text{h}$ the word passed easily into a designation of that omnipotent, intelligent energy, the $\text{r}\hat{\text{u}}(\text{ä})\text{h}$ Elohim, which creates and sustains the visible universe. It was in a "sound of gentle stillness," as of a whispering wind, that

Jehovah revealed himself to Elijah, 1 Kgs. 19:12; in a soft breathing, a $rû(\check{a})h$, that the divine presence was manifested to Eliphaz, Job 4:15; but at the beginning of the Christian dispensation it appeared as a mighty rushing $\piνεῦμα$, Acts 2:2, the intensity of its energy breaking forth, like an electric storm, in visible flames of fire. In all these meanings the primary conception is that of an invisible force which is known only by its effects.

$Rû(\check{a})h$ became in this way a designation of spirituality in its largest form. In the Divine Spirit, the "fountain of lives," $m^eqôr hăy yîm$, Ps. 36:10, is the original source of every human spirit, and therefore the psalmist (31:6) commits his $rû(\check{a})h$, his inmost life, to Jehovah in the full conviction that in so doing he will not lose it, but recover it in wondrous depth and power.

$Něphěsh$ soul.

In biblical language $něphěsh$ is frequently employed in the same sense as $rû(\check{a})h$. As a psychological term it rests on the same physical phenomenon of respiration, being derived from a verb meaning *to breathe* ($niph.$), to recover one's breath after protracted exertion, hence *to be refreshed*, Ex. 23:16. The $něphěsh$ as to its origin and powers is conceived of as standing on a lower plane than the $rû(\check{a})h$, being always associated with its earthy investiture, and never, except in a few anthropopathic expressions, Jer. 51:14, Amos 6:8, rising into the realm of pure spirit. "The souls of animals arise, like plants, from the earth, as a consequence of the divine word of power, Gen. 1:24. Thus the creating Spirit which entered at the beginning, 1:2, into matter, rules in them; their connection with the divine spring of life is through the medium of the common terrestrial creation. But the *human soul* does not spring from the earth; it is created *by a special act of divine inbreathing*, see 2:7 in connection with 1:26." (Oehler.) The $něphěsh$ is the animal life, the $\psi\chi\acute{\eta}$, which springs into existence when the $rû(\check{a})h$ enters the material organism. "Man is not $rû(\check{a})h$, but *has it*,—he is soul." The soul is therefore the center of individuality, so that "my soul," "thy soul," "his soul," etc., become stereotyped expressions for man's inmost personal life, his very self, his ego. $Rû(\check{a})h$ is never so used, since it is the universal principle of life which underlies and conditions the $něphěsh$, and not, like the latter, the individualized form which the principle of life assumes. Hence in the enumeration of a family, tribe, or people, persons are often spoken of as souls, Gen. 14:21; Exod. 1:7; Num. 31:35,—an expression that survives in popular usage to the present time. Indeed, it was even possible to speak of corpses as "dead souls," Num. 6:6; 9:10, i. e. as persons with whom the idea of individuality was still associated after the $rû(\check{a})h$ had been withdrawn.

A marked characteristic of the Priest Code, though not exclusively confined to it, is the employment of $něphěsh$ in the sense of a morally responsible person—"if a soul touch any unclean thing," "if a soul commit trespass," etc. This usage which does not occur in the Book of the Covenant, Exod. 20-23, seems to be owing to the individual application, rather than the universal authority, of the levitical legislation. The same sense seems to attach to the word in Ezek. 18:4, 27, "the soul [i. e. the person] that sinneth, it [he] shall die," "he shall save his soul [himself] alive." It is not probable that the word $něphěsh$ is here employed in the technical modern sense of soul. However true it is that cherished sin involves man's spiritual nature in eternal loss and ruin, this does not seem to be the

thought in the prophet's mind, except inferentially. He is speaking rather of the temporal consequences of sin to the person who commits it.

The soul, like the spirit, is also swayed by strong desires and passions, but these not infrequently emphasize some form of selfishness or greed, Pss. 10:3; 41:3. The essence of sin lies in the self-determination of the individual *nēphēsh* toward earthly relations, in opposition to the divine will and authority, "their soul abhorred my statutes," Lev. 26:43.

The soul of man does not any more than that of the animal possess in itself the reason of an undying life, Ps. 22:29(30). The pledge of its immortality lies in its unbroken union with the Divine Spirit which is individualized in it; "Thou wilt not leave my *nēphēsh* in Sheol," Ps. 16:10. The natural immortality of the soul appears much more prominently in the New Testament than in the Old, where the whole subject of a future life is purposely involved in much obscurity. For the Mosaic dispensation aimed to train men to obedience by means of temporal rewards and penalties rather than by the prospect of post-mortem blessedness.

It does not follow because scriptural language distinguishes between *rû(ă)h* and *nēphēsh* that they are distinct and separable entities, and that man possesses a tripartite nature, body, soul and spirit. These latter terms are rather to be understood as descriptive of man's higher nature contemplated as a unity, but as facing in the one case toward the spiritual world above, and in the other toward the material world beneath.

N'shāmā(h) breath.

The specific term for breath is *n'shāmā(h)*. It occurs only twenty-four times, whereas *nēphēsh* occurs 729, and *rû(ă)h* 376 times. The breath blown on the hands produces a sensation of coolness, and therefore the breath of Jehovah, far more powerful than that of man, is metaphorically described as a freezing wind, Job 37:10. A rapid breathing is a sign of violent passion, as of anger, hence in the breath of Eloah, Job 4:9, or in the blast of the breath of Jehovah's nostrils, 2 Sam. 22:16, the Hebrew poet discerns a punitive agency which overwhelms the wicked in swift and irresistible destruction. As the function of respiration was connected with the power of life in man, so this divine breath, conceived of anthropopathically, was associated with the self-existent and infinite life of Jehovah. The transmission of this "breath of lives," Gen. 2:7, into the nostrils of man communicated to him a portion of the divine principle of life, so that in virtue of it he becomes a partaker of the divine being. On the other hand, should El fix his heart, i. e. his thought, upon himself, rather than on man, and gather back to himself his *rû(ă)h* and his *n'shāmā(h)*, then all flesh would inevitably sink back into its original dust, Job 34:14. The *n'shāmā(h)* of man is also as a lamp or candle which is lighted by Jehovah, Prov. 20:27, and human nature is like a vast cavern into whose darkest recesses this light shines. By its means its intricacies can be explored alike to their mysterious origin in the creative power of God, and to their terminus in the clear light of the eternal world. But when this relation between the divine spirit and the human is ignored, the light in man's nature is extinguished, and having no other source of light, he gropes in hopeless darkness. His life in all its relations becomes to him a series of insoluble enigmas and contradictions.

Bāsār flesh.

Bāsār is the material, external part of man, the corporeal investiture of the immortal and invisible spirit. The LXX. renders it by *σάρξ* 138, *κρέας* 79, and *σῶμα* 16 times. In these several renderings *κρέας* is that from which the thought of organism is most distant, *σάρξ* stands midway between the two, while *σῶμα* designates the perfect instrument of the soul in which the idea of organism is predominant. The bāsār as a living organism is dependent for its existence on its union with the spirit. In itself it is frail and corruptible, exhibiting a constant tendency to dissolve and return to the 'ādhāmāh out of which it was constructed. From such dissolution it is withheld by the renewing and vivifying power of the rū(ă)ḥ. This perishable nature of the bāsār was seen to be a characteristic of all animate creatures, and hence the word soon passed into a broader signification which, ignoring the distinction between bāsār and nē-phēsh, included every form of animal life as well as that of man. Kōl-bāsār, all flesh, denotes all living creatures viewed from the side of their transitory, perishable existence, Gen. 6:13,19; 7:15; Num. 16:22; Ps. 136:25, etc. From this comprehensive meaning it passes into one more restricted, including only the human race, Gen. 6:12; Deut. 5:26; Ps. 145:21; Isa. 40:6. Contrasted with the omnipotence and eternity of God who is absolute spirit, man is only bāsār, flesh, a weak mortal, constantly falling away, Gen. 6:3; Job 10:4; Ps. 78:39. It is the same thought as that emphasized when man is called 'ādhām and 'nōsh, the earth-begotten, and the frail one. A still further limitation of the phrase kōl-bāsār occurs in Joel 2:28; 3:1, where the prophet sees the approaching dispensation accompanied by an effusion of the Spirit upon all flesh. This does not mean the entire race of mankind, *πάσα σάρξ*, John 17:2, but the church of the Messianic age, still conceived of as comprehended within the national limits of Israel. In the old theocracy the Holy Spirit had been given to individuals here and there, enduing them with wisdom and prophetic insight. But in that new Israel the Spirit would come down like rain on all flesh, i. e. on all the people without distinction of age, rank, or condition. The same limitation appears in Jer. 12:12 and Ezek. 20:48.

The Old Testament nowhere teaches that the bāsār, the sensuous part of man's being, is also the seat of sin. It is indeed deeply tainted by sin and enthralled by its power, Gen. 6:12, but the ethical idea of flesh as essentially sinful, and as antagonizing the higher life of the spirit by an illegitimate lusting after sensual and earthly things, is foreign to the Old Testament, and belongs to the fully developed Pauline theology of the New.

Lēbh or Lēbhābh heart.

Lēbhābh, which frequently occurs in place of lēbh, seems to be only a strengthened form of the latter word, and to be used with no discernible difference of meaning. In its physical sense it denotes the central bodily organ, 2 Sam. 18:14; 2 Kgs. 9:24, through which the blood flows, and hence the center of physical life, for the blood was looked on as the vehicle of life, Lev. 17:11. Gliding almost at once into metonymical significations, it becomes one of the most interesting words in the entire Hebrew vocabulary. From the Hebrew it passes with its wealth of meaning into the New Testament, whose writers give it, if possible, a yet richer expansion. In a semi-physical sense it designates the seat of bodily life, Ps.

22:26(27). While on the one hand the whole heart faints through sickness, Isa. 1:5, on the other it is strengthened by food and drink, Gen. 18:5; Jud. 19:5.

The profoundest importance attaches to this word when it is employed in connection with the spiritual nature of man. The external relations of man's nature are described, as we have already seen, by the words *rû(ă)h* and *ně-phěsh*, the former standing for its spiritual and eternal relations, and the latter for the earthly and temporal. There is still another point of view from which it may be studied, viz., in its internal structure and relations. In Hebrew thought the whole interior of this nature, with its innumerable feelings, affections and emotions, its faculties of memory and imagination, its thinking and reasoning powers, its capacities of knowledge and wisdom, its resolutions, plans and purposes, its hopes and fears, its moral and spiritual determinations, in a word, the entire emotional, intellectual, and ethical activity of man is included in this comprehensive word *lēbh*. It is conceived of as an unfathomed and, to man, unfathomable abyss, Ps. 64:6, a dark and mysterious realm filled with undefined thoughts and purposes, with blind desires and passions, driven restlessly to and fro, like disembodied shades, and making their presence known only as they rise into consciousness, or emerge into the actual doings and experiences of the outward world. Pious men are sometimes allowed to fall into temptation, that they may learn the unsuspected contents of their own hearts, 2 Chron. 32:31. By the introduction of sin the *lēbh* becomes wholly corrupted, so that all the imagination of its thoughts is only evil continually, Gen. 6:5. Out of its dismal depths go forth deceptions, Neh. 6:8, hypocrisies, Job 36:13, and wicked works, Ps. 58:2(3). None but God is able to search the secrets of the heart, i. e. explore this inner realm of the spirit, 1 Chron. 28:29; Ps. 44:21(22), and he alone is able to cleanse it from its evil and impure contents, Ps. 51:10(12). So thoroughly is the natural heart corrupted, that this purifying process amounts virtually to the creation of a new heart, Ezek. 18:31. The outward appearance does not always correspond to the inner state of the heart, Prov. 13:14; hence God, who judges every man justly, determines his moral worth by a scrutiny of the heart, 1 Sam. 16:7; Jer. 20:12. The affections and tendencies of the heart determine human destiny, for out of it are the issues of life, Prov. 4:23. (On the Biblical Doctrine of the Heart, see Oehler's *O. T. Theology*, § 71, and "The Hidden Heart," by Tayler Lewis, *Princeton Rev.*, March, 1883.)

K'layôth kidneys, reins.

This word occurs only twenty-six times in the Old Testament, and throughout the Pentateuch is uniformly rendered kidneys. In its fourteen occurrences in the poetical and prophetic books it is, with one exception, Isa. 34:6, rendered reins, LXX. *νεφρός*, Vulg. *ren*. Indeed, wherever the reference is to animals it is translated *kidneys*, but *reins* when it refers to man. In the former case it is used in its strict physiological sense, in the latter by metonymy for a part or side of man's spiritual nature. Five times it is associated with *lēbh*, being with it the subject of divine inspection and examination. It is commonly taken as the seat of the tenderer emotions, such as kindness, pity, and benevolence; but its exact psychological equivalent is very obscure. Rev. J. G. Lansing in the *OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT*, Feb., 1884, starting from a consideration of the physiological functions of the kidneys, argues with much force that the *k'layôth* stand specifically for the *conscience*. In view of the fact that the O. T. writers, with the

whole ancient world, referred the function of thought to the heart rather than to the brain, it seems hardly safe to ascribe to the ancients such accurate knowledge of physiological processes as this definition assumes. Moreover it is open to question whether O. T. writers ever conceived of the conscience as a distinct moral power, or vaguely included it in the moral determinations of the heart.

PIEPENTRING'S OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.*

BY J. B. REYNOLDS, B. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

The possibilities in the field of Old Testament theology have not been so much exhausted but that we may look with high expectations upon any new contributions to the subject. With this view we shall not be disappointed in the work before us. It brings not a little new material and contains many improvements in the mode of presenting the results of the author's studies.

The method is declared to be exegetical and historical. The writer criticises with justice, we think, many of the previous works on Old Testament theology as mere presentations of religious ideas and customs without taking count of their successive development. He, therefore, aims "so far as possible to indicate the historic development of each particular subject," leaving to those works which narrate the history of Israel the burden of giving a general view of its religion.

Therefore, in accordance with his central purpose, the work is divided into three periods. The first extends from Moses to the commencement of the eighth century and is distinguished by the preponderating influence exercised by traditional ideas and usages, modified only in part by early prophetism. The second, reaching from the appearance of the earliest prophetic books to the end of the exile, is marked by the great influence of prophetism, arrived at the summit of its power. The third, from the exile to the first century before the Christian era, is characterized by the extraordinary influence of the written law and of sacerdotalism.

In arranging the literature of these periods the extreme results of the higher criticism are accepted. That part of the Pentateuch commonly called the Jehovistic document is placed in the first period. Deuteronomy is supposed to have been written in the seventh century, while the Elohist document is claimed not to have been written till the fifth century. Isaiah is distributed in small portions from the end of the ninth century to the middle of the sixth. Ecclesiastes and Esther are thought to have been written towards the end of the third century, while Daniel is assigned to a date somewhere between 167 and 164. The question of the date of the authorship of the several books is, however, not discussed, the author merely giving "the results which seem certain or probable." Though there is room for much difference of opinion as to the time to which many books are allotted, it is certainly to be regarded as a virtue that the author thus clearly defines at the outset the literary basis of his work.

*Théologie de l'Ancien Testament par Ch. Piepentrung, pasteur de l'église réformée de Strasbourg. Paris: *Librairie Fischbacher*, 33 rue de Seine. New York: *B. Westermann & Co.*